



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

abrogation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in accordance with the prescriptions of international law.

Even this course could hardly be justified at the present time. The nation owes something to its past in respect of the canal. The official correspondence and declarations of the State Department for more than half a century show clearly that it has always been the purpose of our Government to make any canal that might be constructed at the isthmus neutral and open on equal terms to the ships of all nations. When the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was under consideration in the Senate ten years ago, an effort was made to insert in it before ratification a clause reserving the right on the part of the United States "to discriminate in respect to the charges of traffic in favor of vessels of its own citizens engaged in the coastwise trade." But this proposal was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 43 to 27. Otherwise the treaty would have been rejected by Great Britain and we should not have secured the opportunity to construct the canal. In thus securing release from the obligations of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and acquiring the right to construct and own the canal, we have placed ourselves under special obligation to Great Britain not to make any discrimination in the canal charges in favor of vessels of our own citizens. Of this obligation we cannot honorably divest ourselves by simply declaring that the canal is our own and we will do as we please with it.

Nor on the ground of general public policy and the higher national obligation to the world ought we to make any such discrimination. Our country has always professed to take the lead, and has in fact taken the lead in trying to establish more friendly relations and greater confidence among the nations. The Panama Canal will be, when in operation, in a peculiar sense the leading international waterway of the world, and it ought to be managed in the true international spirit if it is to be productive of the highest good, both to our own country and to the community of the nations. Any gain that might come to our coastwise ship companies by remitting to them the canal tolls would be lost irretrievably to the nation as a whole in other more important ways, and in the long run probably economically also.

We hope that Congress will resist every attempt of a narrow and mistaken patriotism to establish a canal policy which will lower our reputation for honorable conduct among the nations, do us no good economically, and involve us in a controversy with Great Britain, out of which we should certainly come from The Hague beaten and crestfallen.

The Tillman Maximum Battleship.

Suggestions of short-cuts for putting an end to war and to the present rivalry in armaments have often been made, but it remained for Senator Tillman to put the cap-sheaf on proposals of this sort. On the 16th of July he introduced into the Senate the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and it is hereby, instructed to investigate and report to

the Senate what is the maximum size of ship, whether battleship or cruiser; the maximum thickness of armor that such ship can safely carry; the maximum size of gun; the maximum speed; the maximum desirable radius of action of such vessel that can safely be built so as to navigate the ocean and enter the first-class harbors of the world; how much draft can such vessel carry in order to enter the existing dry docks in this country for repairs and safely pass through the Panama Canal, the object being to find out from authentic and reliable official sources the maximum size and maximum draft, the maximum armament, and the maximum thickness of armor to make the very best battleship or cruiser that the world has ever seen or will ever see; to have this country own the greatest marine engine of war ever constructed or ever to be constructed under known conditions; and to report whether one such overpowering vessel would not in its judgment be better for this country to build than to continue by increasing taxation to spend the millions and millions of dollars now in prospect in the race for naval supremacy. Let such vessel be named the "Terror" and become the peacemaker of the world. Let us find out just how far we can go with any degree of safety and go there at once. Let us leave some money in the Treasury for other more necessary and useful expenditures, such as good roads, controlling the floods in the Mississippi, draining swamp land in the South, and irrigating the arid land in the West.

This resolution got immediate consideration and was adopted by the Senate without a dissenting voice!

It is nearly impossible to read this remarkable resolution and note the action of the Senate upon it, without having an inextinguishable fit of laughter. Was the Senator serious in his proposal, or did he take this course simply to ridicule the more effectively the present absurd and ruinous rivalry of armaments among the great powers, and the manner in which our country is allowing itself needlessly and weakly to be drawn into the furious current? Perhaps the Hague Court might answer this preliminary question of interpretation.

Nor is it any easier to fathom the motives which led the Senators to approve offhand the resolution. Were they merely mercifully burying it in the files of the Committee on Naval Affairs, out of sympathy with the Senator from South Carolina in the affliction which has befallen him, or did they really, by this course, expect to get some light on the pressing problem of naval armament which is troubling all their dreams?

The Committee on Naval Affairs seems in part at least to have taken seriously the task which the resolution has laid upon it. If reports are to be trusted, the Committee will make an investigation and report to the Senate what, in its judgment, is the biggest, heaviest, most perfect and powerful marine engine of war that can be taken through the Panama Canal. The Committee is certainly fortunate in finding a standard of estimation so ready at hand.

But, to take the thing seriously, suppose that this "Terror" should be built, and we should possess the mightiest Superdreadnaught in the world, a ship which could only just be gotten through the Panama Canal, how much nearer should we be to the end of naval rivalry than we are today? England laid down the first Dreadnaught a few years ago and thought that she had put all other governments out of the race. How long did they stay out? Germany, Japan and the United States all immediately took up the challenge, and Great Britain is harder pushed today to keep ahead in the race than ever before.

The trouble with this whole "maximum" business is that there is no possible maximum. If our government should design and build the Tillman "Terror," it would not have been launched before England, Germany, France, Japan or Russia would have announced a bigger and completer monster. Then we should construct another and be compelled to rebuild the Panama Canal, push out its walls and greatly deepen it, at a cost of further hundreds of millions, in order to get our "overpowering vessel" through the big ditch. The only final term in this brainless race for naval supremacy is bankruptcy and ruin. The chancelleries of the world powers are racked with constant nightmares because they all see this fate staring them in the face. And yet no government has had the good sense and courage to inaugurate a movement of another sort which would quickly and easily put an end to the consuming naval plague of our time.

The New Executive Director.

At the last meeting of the executive committee of the American Peace Society, held on June 28, Arthur Deerin Call, M. A., of Hartford, Conn., was by a unanimous vote elected executive director of the society, created at the annual meeting in May.

Mr. Call's record, of which we give herewith a few salient features, shows him to be a strong, progressive man and one of exceptional fitness for this important position, the creation of which has been made necessary by the great growth and expansion of the society's work in recent years.

Mr. Call was born in Fabius, N. Y., September, 1869. He was graduated from the State Normal School, Cortland, N. Y., in 1892, and from Brown University in 1896. In 1903 and 1904 he did work as a graduate student in philosophy and education at Yale University, and in 1905 he took the degree of M. A. at Brown.

His first position after graduation was that of director of schools at the New York State Reformatory, at Elmira. He was then chosen superintendent of schools of Holliston, Medway and Sherborn, Mass., a position which he held for three years.



ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

In July, 1904, he was elected district superintendent of schools at Hartford, Conn. He has held this position until the present time. His prominence as an educator in the State and the efficiency of his work as a superintendent led to his election two years ago as president of the New England Association of School Superintendents.

Mr. Call is a member of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, and also of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education. He is joint author of the Metcalf & Call Readers, prepared for general use in the schools of the country.

He has frequently contributed articles to magazines, especially those dealing with educational problems.

Mr. Call is already well acquainted with the international peace movement. He was one of the founders of the Connecticut Peace Society, a branch of the American Peace Society, in 1906, and has been president of the society ever since its organization. He has been for four years past a member of the board of directors of the American Peace Society, and is therefore well acquainted with the society's history and work and with the new plans for the wider development and extension of its labors throughout the nation. He has done a good deal of lecturing on arbitration and peace sub-